

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

JIHAD ANTHONY ZOGHEIB,

Petitioner,

v.

BRIAN WILLIAMS, et al.,

Respondents.

Case No. 2:22-cv-01213-GMN-VCF

Order Serving Petition

Jihad Anthony Zogheib submitted a *pro se* 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas petition, an amended petition and has now paid the filing fee. (ECF Nos. 1-1, 4, 5.) The court has conducted a preliminary review of the petition and directs that it be served on respondents.

A petition for federal habeas corpus should include all claims for relief of which petitioner is aware. If petitioner fails to include such a claim in his petition, he may be forever barred from seeking federal habeas relief upon that claim. See 28 U.S.C. §2244(b) (successive petitions). If petitioner is aware of any claim not included in his petition, he should notify the court of that as soon as possible, perhaps by means of a motion to amend his petition to add the claim.

Zogheib has also submitted a motion for appointment of counsel. (ECF No. 1-2.) There is no constitutional right to appointed counsel in a federal habeas corpus proceeding. *Luna v. Kernan*, 784 F.3d 640, 642 (9th Cir. 2015) (citing *Lawrence v.*

1 *Florida*, 549 U.S. 327, 336–37 (2007)). An indigent petitioner may request appointed
2 counsel to pursue habeas relief. 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B). The decision to appoint
3 counsel is generally discretionary. *Id.* § 3006A(a)(2) (authorizing appointment of counsel
4 “when the interests of justice so require”). However, counsel is appropriate if the
5 complexities of the case are such that denial of counsel would amount to a denial of due
6 process, and where the petitioner is so uneducated that he is incapable of fairly
7 presenting his claims. *LaMere v. Risley*, 827 F.2d 622, 626 (9th Cir. 1987); *Brown v.*
8 *United States*, 623 F.2d 54, 61 (9th Cir. 1980). Here, Zogheib’s petition generally
9 presents his claims in a reasonably clear manner, and the legal issues do not appear to
10 be particularly complex. Therefore, the court denies the motion without prejudice at this
11 time.
12

13
14 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the Clerk of Court detach, file, and
15 electronically SERVE the petition (ECF No. 1-1) on respondents.

16 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk add Aaron D. Ford, Nevada Attorney
17 General, as counsel for respondents and provide respondents an electronic copy of all
18 items previously filed in this case by regenerating the Notice of Electronic Filing to the
19 office of the AG only.
20

21 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk detach and file petitioner’s motion for
22 appointment of counsel (ECF No. 1-2).

23 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the motion for counsel is **DENIED** without
24 prejudice.

25 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that respondents file a response to the petition,
26 including potentially by motion to dismiss, within **90 days** of service of the petition, with
27 any requests for relief by petitioner by motion otherwise being subject to the normal
28

1 briefing schedule under the local rules. Any response filed is to comply with the
2 remaining provisions below, which are entered pursuant to Habeas Rule 5.

3 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that any procedural defenses raised by respondents
4 in this case be raised together in a single consolidated motion to dismiss. In other
5 words, the court does not wish to address any procedural defenses raised herein either
6 in seriatum fashion in multiple successive motions to dismiss or embedded in the
7 answer. Procedural defenses omitted from such motion to dismiss will be subject to
8 potential waiver. Respondents should not file a response in this case that consolidates
9 their procedural defenses, if any, with their response on the merits, except pursuant to
10 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(2) as to any unexhausted claims clearly lacking merit. If
11 respondents do seek dismissal of unexhausted claims under § 2254(b)(2): (a) they will
12 do so within the single motion to dismiss not in the answer; and (b) they will specifically
13 direct their argument to the standard for dismissal under § 2254(b)(2) set forth in
14 *Cassett v. Stewart*, 406 F.3d 614, 623-24 (9th Cir. 2005). In short, no procedural
15 defenses, including exhaustion, should be included with the merits in an answer. All
16 procedural defenses, including exhaustion, instead must be raised by motion to dismiss.
17


18 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, in any answer filed on the merits, respondents
19 specifically cite to and address the applicable state court written decision and state
20 court record materials, if any, regarding each claim within the response as to that claim.
21

22 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that petitioner has **45 days** from service of the
23 answer, motion to dismiss, or other response to file a reply or opposition, with any other
24 requests for relief by respondents by motion otherwise being subject to the normal
25 briefing schedule under the local rules.
26
27
28

1 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that any additional state court record exhibits filed
2 herein by either petitioner or respondents be filed with a separate index of exhibits
3 identifying the exhibits by number. The parties will identify filed CM/ECF attachments by
4 the number or numbers of the exhibits in the attachment.
5

6 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, at this time, the parties send courtesy copies of
7 **any responsive pleading or motion and all INDICES OF EXHIBITS ONLY** to the
8 Reno Division of this court. Courtesy copies shall be mailed to the Clerk of Court, 400
9 S. Virginia St., Reno, NV, 89501, and directed to the attention of "Staff Attorney" on the
10 outside of the mailing address label. **No further courtesy copies are required unless**
11 **and until requested by the court.**
12
13
14

15 DATED: 13 October 2022.

16 
17 _____
18 GLORIA M. NAVARRO
19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28